



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/455,623	12/07/1999	ROBERT JOHN BAIYOR	BAIYOR-1-9-1	5406

7590 09/04/2002

NANCY R GAMBURD
GAMBURD & ASSOCIATES LTD
10 SOUTH LASALLE STREET
SUITE 3300
CHICAGO, IL 606031002

EXAMINER

NGUYEN, QUYNH H

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2642

DATE MAILED: 09/04/2002

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/455,623

Applicant(s)

BAIYOR ET AL.

Examiner

Quynh H Nguyen

Art Unit

2642

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 07 December 1999.
- 2a) ☐ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-57 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-57 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s) _____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

2. Claims 1-57 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bernstein (U.S. Patent 5,583,925) in view of Eisdorfer et al. (U.S. Patent 5,724,411).

Regarding claim 1, Bernstein teaches a method for telecommunication conferencing in a multiple leg telecommunication session, the method comprising: a) receiving an incoming call leg designating a primary directory number (col. 1, lines 44-45); b) determining a plurality of secondary directory numbers associated with the primary directory number (col. 1, lines 47-48); c) processing and routing each outgoing call leg associated with each secondary directory number of the plurality of secondary directory numbers to form a plurality of outgoing call legs

Art Unit: 2642

(col. 1, lines 48-50); e) connecting an answered outgoing call leg, of the plurality of outgoing call legs, to the incoming call leg for a multiple leg telecommunication conferencing session (col. 1, lines 49-50). However, Bernstein does not teach d) monitoring answering of the plurality of outgoing call legs. Eisdorfer et al. teach monitoring answering of the plurality of outgoing call legs (col. 3, lines 16-22). It would have been obvious to one of skill in the art to monitor answering outgoing call legs after routing them in order to either connect it to incoming call leg or alert it for a predetermined period of time then tear down the call.

Regarding claims 2, 19, and 36, Bernstein discloses determining whether the primary number and its associated plurality of secondary directory numbers are configured for a conference mode (col. 3, line 67 thru col. 4, line 15).

Regarding claims 3, 20, and 37, Bernstein and Eisdorfer et al. do not teach continuing to alert an unanswered outgoing call leg, of the plurality of outgoing call legs, until a predetermined period of time has elapsed. Obviously, alerting an unanswered outgoing call leg will stop after a predetermined period of time has expired.

Regarding claims 4, 6, 21, 23, 38, and 40 Bernstein disclose⁵ when the predetermined period of time has elapsed, releasing any outgoing call leg, of the plurality of outgoing call legs, which has remained unanswered (col. 7, lines 2-5 and Fig. 6, 404-16, 404-18).

Claims 5, 22, and 39 are rejected for the same reasons as claim 1 for the second route when a second predetermined period of time has elapsed.

Regarding claims 7, 24, and 41 Bernstein discloses the predetermined period of time is determined from a no answer time parameter (col. 7, lines 2-4).

Claims 8-10, 25-27, and 42-44 are rejected for the same reasons as claim 1 e).

Regarding claim 11, full duplex is simply well known in the multiple leg teleconference session. For example, outgoing call legs and incoming call legs.

Regarding claims 12, 13, 28, 29, 45, and 46, Bernstein discloses the plurality of secondary directory numbers corresponding to the primary directory number and a conference mode designation are predefined and stored in a database (Fig. 1, 225), or providing an interface with the database for subscriber determination of the plurality of secondary directory numbers and a conferencing mode is inherent.

Regarding claim 14, Bernstein discloses determining the plurality of directory numbers is performed by a database query designating the primary directory number (col. 1, lines 36-39).

Regarding claims 15, 16, 30, 31, 47, and 48 Bernstein discloses terminating the multiple leg telecommunication conference session upon termination of the incoming call leg, or a penultimate call leg remaining from a plurality of call legs forming the multiple leg telecommunication conferencing session (col. 7, lines 12-19).

Regarding claims 17, 32, and 49, Bernstein as discussed above. However, Bernstein does not disclose concurrent alerting of a corresponding plurality of outgoing call legs. Eisdorfer et al. disclose differentially processing and routing each outgoing call leg associated with each secondary directory number of the plurality of secondary directory numbers to provide concurrent alerting of a corresponding plurality of outgoing call legs (col. 3, lines 10-19).

Regarding claim 18, Bernstein disclose a system for telecommunication conferencing in a multiple leg telecommunication session, the system comprising: a database having stored in a memory a plurality of secondary directory numbers associated with a primary directory number

(Fig. 1, 225 and col. 2, line 63 thru col. 3, line 3); and a switching center coupled to the database (Fig. 1, 205, 210, 215, and 220). This claim is also rejected for the same reasons as claim 1.

Regarding claim 33, the home location register is inherent in mobile communication.

Regarding claim 34, Bernstein as discussed above. However, Bernstein does not disclose mobile switching center. Eisdorfer et al. disclose the switching center is a mobile switching center (col. 4, lines 66-67).

Regarding claim 35, Bernstein discloses an apparatus for telecommunication conferencing in a multiple leg telecommunication session, the apparatus comprising: a network interface for reception of an incoming call leg designating a primary directory number and for transmission of an outgoing call leg; a memory (col. 3, lines 35-38) storing a plurality of secondary directory numbers associated with the primary directory number; a processor coupled to the network interface and to the memory (col. 2, line 38 thru col. 3, line 3).

Regarding claim 50, Bernstein as discussed above. However, Bernstein does not disclose mobile communication conferencing system. Eisdorfer et al. disclose a mobile switching center having an interface (col. 4, lines 66-67 and Fig. 1, 130); a home location register is inherent in mobile communication; a conference bridge coupled to the mobile switching center is simply well known in the art. For example, participants use wireless telephone.

Claims 51-56 are rejected for the same reasons as claim 3 and 4, 5, 13, 15-17, respectively, since the mobile switching center is comprising: 5ESS switch and ECP, therefore same instructions processing as in regular switching environment.

Regarding claim 57, Bernstein as discussed above. However, Bernstein does not disclose the reception of a LocationRequest containing the pilot directory number, the home location

Art Unit: 2642

register transmits an ANSI-41 compatible LocationRequest RETURN RESULT to the mobile switching center, the ANSI-41 compatible LocationRequest RETURN RESULT containing a listing of each secondary directory number, the conference parameter, and corresponding routing, answering and terminating parameters for each secondary directory number. The use of ANSI-41 protocol is obvious at least in the mobile communications.

Conclusion

3. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Bertrand (U.S. Patent 6,408,173) teaches Billing ID correlation for inter-technology roaming (which teaches the use of ANSI-41 protocol in mobile communications). Harlow et al. (U.S. Patent 5,206,901) teach method and apparatus for alerting multiple telephones for an incoming call.

4. Any response to this action should be mailed to:

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks

Washington, D.C. 20231

or faxed to:

(703) 308-6306, (for formal communications intended for entry, please label the response "EXPEDITED PROCEDURE")

or: (703) 308-6296, (for informal or draft communication, please label "PROPOSED" or "DRAFT")

Hand-delivered responses should be brought to Crystal Park II, 2121 Crystal Drive, Arlington, VA, Sixth Floor (Receptionist).


Art Unit: 2642

5. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Quynh H. Nguyen whose telephone number is 703-305-5451. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Thursday from 6:30 A.M. to 5:00 P.M.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Ahmad Matar, can be reached on (703) 305-4731. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9314.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-305-4700.

qhn
Quynh H. Nguyen
August 20, 2002


AHMAD MATAR
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2600